

Application No. 10/677,188
Amendment dated March 13, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 14, 2005

REMARKS

In the pending Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 and objected to Claims 3-18 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner allowed Claims 19-27. By this Amendment and Response, Applicant has cancelled Claims 1 and 2 and amended Claims 3-18. Claims 3-27 are pending in this application.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Kley (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,021). Without agreeing with the Examiner's statements regarding the teachings of the Van Kley patent or the Examiner's conclusions regarding Applicant's invention, Applicant has cancelled Claims 1 and 2, and has rewritten Claims 3-18 to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Craig C. Groeth
Craig C. Groeth
Registration No. 31,713
P.O. Box 2783
Rapid City, SD 57702
(605) 716-1836

Date: March 13, 2006